

COMMENTS FROM NOVEMBER 9, 2004 PUBLIC WORKSHOP



US 113 North / South Study

November 2004

Georgetown Area

Georgetown Workshop Summary

- ▶ Georgetown attendees provided fewer written comments than those in Milford and Millsboro.
- The most dominant theme was related to east-west traffic. Many attendees indicated that east-west traffic is more of a problem than north-south traffic in Georgetown. There was widespread support for those alternatives that use Arrow Safety Road and Park Avenue to bypass Georgetown to the south. Such an alternative would tie into improvements planned by Sussex County for Park Avenue, relocating it around a runway extension at the county airport.
- ▶ Only 20 people commented on the on-alignment alternatives, but of those 75 percent expressed some support. Those providing positive comments did not distinguish between on-alignment options 1 and 2, despite the fact that they function very differently.
- ▶ Over 70 percent of those commenting on the east bypass alternatives disliked them, generally citing property impacts. It was generally felt that alternative B was too far out of the way, while alternative C is too close to the center of Georgetown and is too limiting to growth. Neither addresses east-west traffic.
- ▶ The west bypass alternatives received the most written feedback, with about 60 percent of the comments positive. Sections D, E, 1, and 2 received more positive than negative comments, but not by a substantial margin.
- ► Four respondents recommended the no-build alternative in conjunction with limiting development.

Georgetown Working Group Summary

- ▶ There was no consensus among the working group members regarding any of the alternatives. The only clearly shared view was that any successful alternative must address east-west traffic on SR 404 and US 9 in addition to north-south traffic on US 113. Use of Park Avenue to facilitate east-west traffic was discussed.
- ▶ On-alignment alternatives gathered some support, especially south of US 9, but most comments were related to the specific elements of each option rather than preference for one option or the other. Issues to be addressed during 2005 include impacts to existing businesses, Del Tech access, and traffic flow.
- ▶ Working group members were somewhat evenly divided regarding the east bypass alternatives. Some favored a close-in bypass (C) to reduct property impacts and costs. Others preferred going farther east (B) to accommodate planned growth in Georgetown and reduce noise and other impacts in the center of town. It was agreed that east bypasses are less effective than other alternatives in addressing east-west traffic.
- The most important element shared by the west bypasses appears to be the ability to connect SR 404 with Park Avenue to bypass Georgetown east-west. It was suggested that a west bypass could be phased, with that connection occurring first and extensions to the north and south constructed later.



COMMENTS FROM NOVEMBER 9, 2004 PUBLIC WORKSHOP



US 113 North / South Study

November 2004

Georgetown Area

Agency Summary

- ▶ The agencies will have an opportunity to review the Georgetown area bypass alternatives at the JPR meeting on January 13, 2005.
- ► Concern was expressed regarding the west side access road associated with onalignment option 2. It was felt that this alignment may have adverse resource impacts.

County

Sussex County is working on improvements to Park Avenue that will tie in either at Arrow Safety Road or South Bedford Street. The County has indicated some preference for a west bypass alternative that ties into those improvements.

Overall Summary / Recommended Action

- Any successful alternative in Georgetown will need to effectively address east-west traffic.
- None of the alternatives enjoys a broad base of support at this time. Only the east bypasses even exhibited a clear lack of support from the public. Additional data on resource impacts, traffic, economic impacts, and cost will be instrumental in narrowing down the range of alternatives.